



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/735,950	12/14/2003	Jeffrey D. Davies	111803.P001	3725

7590 01/24/2007
Mark S. Peloquin
PELOQUIN, PLLC
Suite 4100
800 Fifth Avenue
Seattle, WA 98104-3100

EXAMINER

SPISICH, GEORGE D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3616

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/24/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/735,950	DAVIES, JEFFREY D.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	George D. Spisich	3616	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 November 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-17 and 30-43 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 18-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 November 2006 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

Corrections to the specification filed November 3, 2006 do not appear to identify the properly replaced paragraph. Examiner is unclear if paragraphs have been deleted. Currently it appears that paragraph numbering is off by "2". For instance, Applicant has replaced paragraphs [0045],[0046],[0054],[0063] etc, however these replacement paragraphs are [0043],[0044],[0052],[0061] etc. respectively in the original specification.

Appropriate correction is required.

Drawings

The drawings filed November 3, 2006 are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "602" in Figure 6 has still been used to designate both the transmission shaft and the transmission housing. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner,

Art Unit: 3616

the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 24,25,28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

These claims relate to a vehicle model and are inherently unclear. The transmission and vehicle structure is all that is relevant in a patent claim not the name of the particular vehicle that includes a transmission. More specifically, the transmissions in these models may not be the same from year to year, may have optional transmissions, or the vehicles model may be discontinued in the future, therefore, the claim is unclear.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3616

Claims 18, 19 and 24-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pestotnik (USPN 6,182,784) (provided in Applicant's IDS) in view of Hasegawa et al. (USPUB 2003/0070848) and further in view of Grayson (USPN 5,247,845).

Pestotnik discloses an ATV having a transmission, the transmission having a shaft and a housing and further having a power takeoff shaft (56a) that transfers energy to an external device. Pestotnik discloses a sub-transmission (see col. 6, lines 51-67) that includes a normal, low and "super" low speed/gear position. Furthermore, it is stated that the device is placed in a neutral position.

However, Pestotnik does not disclose power being transferred from the engine to the transmission without a belt or the transmission shaft or having a releasably connectable shaft extension that is coupled to the transmission shaft and "accessible" through an opening in the transmission housing.

Hasegawa et al. discloses the well known aspect of using an engine, a transmission and a PTO where the power from the engine is transferred to transmission shaft without a belt. Using a belt transmission is not the only type of transmission known or that would be compatible with the arrangement of Pestotnik.

Grayson discloses a power takeoff arrangement having a transmission/drive shaft (12) and an opening through which a transmission shaft extension (30) is releasably coupled thereto. Providing a shaft member that transitions to a driven device is a well-known feature in transmission devices.

Art Unit: 3616

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the arrangement of Pestotnik by providing a "beltless" transmission as taught by Hasegawa et al. and a transmission shaft extension/adapter that is releasably connectable to the transmission shaft through an opening in the transmission housing as taught by Grayson so as to provide an "adaptability" feature to the PTO arrangement and improve it's versatility.

With respect to Claims 24,25,28 and 29, Examiner is interpreting these claims to be a transmission that is an ATV transmission on a comparable vehicle as Hasegawa et al.

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pestotnik in view Hasegawa et al. in further view of Grayson as applied to claims 18,19 and 24-29 above, and further in view of Laflamme (USPN 6,672,414).

Pestotnik in view Hasegawa et al. and Grayson does not disclose a PTO including a hydraulic pump.

Laflamme discloses an ATV having a PTO incorporating a hydraulic pump.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Pestotnik in view of Grayson by providing a PTO unit including a hydraulic pump as taught by Laflamme as a hydraulic pump is a versatile and useful means of powering an external device.

With respect to the limitation that the apparatus can generate at least 3000 psi of hydraulic pressure with a volume flow of 10 gallons per minute, it would have been

Art Unit: 3616

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide components (PTO, transmission, engine, vehicle) that would allow for the claimed operation as providing a certain size is within the scope of one of ordinary skill in the art to meet a desired performance requirement.

Claims 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pestotnik in view of Hasegawa et al. and Grayson as applied to claims 18,19 and 24-29 above, and further in view of Yokoyama (USPN 5,144,852).

Pestotnik in view of Hasegawa et al. and Grayson do not specifically disclose a sub-transmission plate providing a neutral position as claimed. Although Pestotnik discloses a sub-transmission and a plurality of shift positions (col. 6, lines 51-67), Examiner is not relying on this detail to be a transmission plate containing a position.

Yokoyama (Fig. 1) discloses a shift plate having a plurality of positions. The relevance is merely in a providing a shift plate having position.

With respect to claims 22 and 23, the dependency of these claims from 21 does not require that a transmission shift plate be required to have a plurality of neutral positions and furthermore it is proper to use the terms "high", "low" or "super low" positions to describe any gear position as these detail likewise are not claimed so as to be included in one arrangement. Therefore, it is proper to refer to a single gear position as high or low in one interpretation and low or super low in another.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a shift plate arrangement as taught by Yokoyama in the sub-transmission gear selection

Art Unit: 3616

arrangement as disclosed by Pestotnik so as to provide a position engagement and indication of the proper and desired gear position while providing a neutral position between two gear positions that may be called a high and low, or a low and super low, which is consistent with the gear positions disclosed by Pestotnik.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed November 3, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to Applicant's argument that vehicle models and transmissions used in the claimed models are readily identifiable in commercial literature, Examiner disagrees and maintains the rejection. A vehicle model is inherently unclear due to at least the temporary aspect of models and the transmissions that are matched with a particular model in a particular model year. These transmissions and models can be and likely are changed in the future rendering the claim unclear.

With respect to Applicant's argument that the Pestotnik does not disclose delivering power to an apparatus in a neutral position while not driving the wheels, Examiner disagrees and maintains the rejection. Disclosing an arrangement for pumping water to put out forest fires that is operated from power from the engine when the vehicle is in neutral is disclosure that the vehicle is not moving (ie. In neutral), yet powering an accessory pump for pumping water.

Art Unit: 3616

With respect to the deficiencies in a CVT transmission being susceptible to friction due to water infiltration, mud, etc., Examiner points out that the device must only meet the claim limitations to properly reject the claim.

With respect to Applicant's argument that Grayson does not transmission shaft extension, Examiner disagrees and maintains the rejection. Grayson discloses a PTO shaft adapter for a drive shaft. The PTO of Pestotnik shows a transmission shaft extension. Grayson teaches the use of a shaft extension off of a drive/power transferring shaft which is analogous to the art of PTO's and properly modifies Pestotnik.

With respect to Applicant's argument that the claimed invention is not similar to the hydraulic pump of Laflamme, Examiner disagrees and maintains the rejection. The retrofitting aspect of Laflamme does not prevent the teaching that a hydraulic pump can be incorporated on an ATV with a PTO which is all that is required.

With respect to Applicant's argument that Examiner ignores the fact that the manufacturer of the transmissions used in the claimed vehicle ATV models did not provide a neutral position on the shift plate, this does not prevent Yokoyama from teaching this detail and properly modifying the base references.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 3616

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Stephenson et al. (USPN 5,427,192), Moseley (USPN 5,248,001).


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George D. Spisich whose telephone number is (571) 272-6676. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00 to 6:30 except alt. Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paul Dickson can be reached on (571) 272-6669. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3616

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

George D. Spisich
January 21, 2007



LESLEY D. MORRIS
SENIOR PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600